UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/523,850	02/07/2005	Thomas John	3208	4407	
Striker Striker &	7590 09/16/201 & Stenby	EXAMINER			
103 East Neck l	Road	NGUYEN, PHONG H			
Huntington, NY	. 11743		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3724		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/16/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		App	lication No.	Applicant(s)		
			23,850	JOHN ET AL.		
Office Action Summary			niner	Art Unit		
		PHO	NG H. NGUYEN	3724		
 Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communic				address	
A SHC WHICH - Extens after S - If NO p - Failure Any re	PRIENT STATUTORY PERIOD FOHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MA ions of time may be available under the provisions of IX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communeriod for reply is specified above, the maximum stature to reply within the set or extended period for reply within the set of	ILING DATE C 37 CFR 1.136(a). In nication. Itory period will apply ill, by statute, cause t	PF THIS COMMUNION no event, however, may a said will expire SIX (6) MON the application to become AE	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status						
2a)⊠ ∃ 3)□ \$	Responsive to communication(s) filed This action is FINAL . 2t Since this application is in condition followed in accordance with the practice	o)∏ This action or allowance ex	n is non-final. cept for formal matt	• •	he merits is	
Dispositio	on of Claims					
5)	he specification is objected to by the he drawing(s) filed on is/are:	e withdrawn from the withdrawn from the withdrawn from the control of the withdrawn from	ion requirement. or b)∐ objected to			
_ F	Applicant may not request that any objecti Replacement drawing sheet(s) including to The oath or declaration is objected to b	he correction is r	equired if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37	CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority ur	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notice 3) Inform	s) of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTo ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	O-948)	Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application 		

Art Unit: 3724

DETAILED ACTION

In view of the Appeal brief filed on 06/17/2010, PROSECUTION IS
 HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejections are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/Boyer D. Ashley/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3724.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3724

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 29-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frederick (3,880,028) in view of Tjaden (3,821,910), and Ota (JP1994-102480).

Regarding claim 29, Frederick teaches a method for cutting a continuously moving glass sheet during production of flat glass with an inhomogeneous thickness distribution across the glass sheet, the method comprising the steps of:

a) providing a moving glass sheet 12 that is continuously moving in a travel direction;

b) moving a cutting tool 16 across the moving glass sheet at an angle (90 degrees) to the travel direction of the moving glass sheet so that the cutting tool traverses a plurality of positions on the glass sheet;

f) mechanically breaking the glass sheet along the fissure (by a snap roll 21);

See Figs. 1-2.

Art Unit: 3724

Frederick does not teach steps (c), (e) and (g) which are to apply variable cutting force on the glass sheet wherein the cutting force is increased where the variable thickness increases and the cutting force is decreased where the variable thickness decreases, and to control the variable cutting force.

Tjaden teaches a method for applying variable cutting force on the glass sheet wherein the cutting force is increased where the variable thickness increases and the cutting force is decreased where the variable thickness decreases, and for controlling variable cutting force for making a uniform score line on the glass sheet. See col. 1, lines 25-30; and col. 3, line 67-col. 4, line 3.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate steps (c), (e) and (g) as taught by Tjaden to the cutting method of Frederick for making a uniform score line on a glass sheet.

Frederick does not teach step (d) which is to measure the thickness of the glass sheet.

Ota teaches the step of measuring a thickness of a glass sheet 2 by a measurement sensor 4 so that a proper amount cutting force can be determined according to the thickness information for making a good cut on the glass sheet.

See Fig. 1

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the step of measuring a thickness of a glass sheet so that a proper amount

cutting force can be determined according to the thickness information as taught by Ota to the cutting method of Frederick for making a good cut on the glass sheet.

Regarding claim 30, a position sensor 30 for detecting the position of the cutting tool 16 across the glass sheet 12 is best seen in Figs. 1-2 in Frederick. A position sensor 4 also is best seen in Fig. 2 in Ota.

Regarding claim 31, Tjaden and Ota teach varying cutting force according to change in thickness of a glass sheet. See col. 3, line 67-col. 4, line 3 in Tjaden and Figs. 1, 2, 4 and 5 in Ota.

Regarding claims 32, 33 and 35, a controller 10 for controlling cutting pressure is best seen in Fig. 1 in Ota. A controller (60, 90) for controlling cutting pressure is best seen in Fig. 3 in Tjaden.

Regarding claim 34, Frederick teaches a method for cutting a continuously moving glass sheet during production of flat glass with an inhomogeneous thickness distribution across the glass sheet, the method comprising the steps of:

- a) providing a moving glass sheet 12 that is continuously moving in a travel direction;
- b) moving a cutting tool 16 across the moving glass sheet at an angle (90 degrees) to the travel direction of the moving glass sheet so that the cutting tool

Art Unit: 3724

traverses a

plurality of positions on the glass sheet;

e) mechanically breaking the glass sheet along the fissure (by a snap roll

21); and

See Figs. 1-2.

Frederick does not teach steps (c), (e) and (g) which are to apply variable cutting force on the glass sheet wherein the cutting force is increased where the variable thickness increases and the cutting force is decreased where the variable thickness decreases, and to control the variable cutting force.

Tjaden teaches a method for applying variable cutting force on the glass sheet wherein the cutting force is increased where the variable thickness increases and the cutting force is decreased where the variable thickness decreases, and for controlling variable cutting force for making a uniform score line. See col. 1, lines 25-30; and col. 3, line 67-col. 4, line 3.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate steps (c), (e) and (g) as taught by Tjaden to the cutting method of Frederick for making a uniform score line.

Frederick does not teach step (d) which is to measure the thickness of the glass sheet.

Ota teaches the step of measuring a thickness of a glass sheet 2 by a measurement sensor 4 so that a proper amount cutting force can be determined according to the thickness information for making a good cut on the glass sheet. See Fig. 1

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the step of measuring a thickness of a glass sheet so that a proper amount cutting force can be determined according to the thickness information as taught by Ota to the cutting method of Frederick for making a good cut on the glass sheet.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 29 and 34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment filed on 02/04/209 necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is

Art Unit: 3724

filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHONG H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)272-4510. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on 571-272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Art Unit: 3724

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-

9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Phong H Nguyen/ Examiner, Art Unit 3724 August 26, 2010